REMARKS

The claims have been reworded in order to enhance their clarity, as discussed during the telephonic interview summarized by the examiner in the paper of August 22, 2007. The scope of the claim has not been changed. The claims are supported for all the same reasons as previously discussed. No new matter has been added.

The new claim language even more clearly indicates that all requirements of 35 USC §112 and §101 are met. The claims now clearly show what was always inherent at least either in the prior claims, i.e., that the invention relates to a system for MRI imaging of a body and to a method for obtaining an MRI image of a body. That the system and method have real life utility is undeniable. MRI imaging systems and methodology is a huge worldwide business.

As previously discussed, Foo et al. is distinguished at least in view of claim language referring to the occurrence at the same time of the conventional space-encoding radiant echo pulse sequences and additional sequences achieving a maximum moment M_1 without affecting M_0 of the space encoding sequences. This has previously been argued based on the former version of the claims which did reflect this simultaneity of pulses, the examiner's comments to the contrary notwithstanding (see page 2 of the office action).

The examiner refers to column 3, lines 31-50 of Foo et al. with respect to the occurrence of these pulse sequences at the same time. (Page 9 of the office action) However, this passage of Foo makes no reference whatsoever to such simultaneity. Nor does any other portion of Foo even imply that the mentioned pulses are to occur at the same time.

In fact, as previously pointed out of record, Foo states just the opposite, i.e., that its additional pulses do not occur at the same time as the space encoding pulses. See figures 4 and 6 where, in each case, flow sensitive gradients are shown as different from and not occurring at the same time as phase encoding gradients and gradient crushers. See, in figure 4, for example, items 162, 164 and 166 versus items 172, 174, 176 and 178; and in figure 6, see, for example, items 242, 244 and 246 versus items 252, 254, 256 and 258. Clearly, Foo et al. cannot possibly anticipate the claims. Moreover, Foo et al. cannot possibly render the claims obvious since there is nothing in the reference to even suggest modifying its systems and processes in the way

required to arrive at the claimed invention, e.g., because Foo does not suggest that the two relevant sequences occur at the same time.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Anthony J. Zelano/
Anthony J. Zelano, Reg. No. 27,969
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: BRESSEL-0001

Date: October 16, 2007
AJZ:hlw K:\effert\1\REPLY to Final Rejection.doc